

period of the 30th Congress, and had been occupied with the subject of providing a government for California as well as New Mexico; and it was only during a recess of Congress that the people of California assembled and sent here a constitution. The whole difference, then, is, that Congress was actually in session in the one case, and had adjourned or taken a recess in the other. It is six in the one case and half a dozen in the other. The principle is precisely the same. The Senator from Michigan says that it is the right of the people, whether ten or ten thousand, to assemble, without a previous law, to form a government—so I understand him. He says there must be a beginning somewhere. I agree that it is their right to assemble, as they have once assembled; and I believe that nobody complained of it when they assembled in New Mexico, and, by their convention, sent here an application for the establishment of a territorial government. Nobody objected to that application. It went for nothing, it amounted to nothing, unless sanctioned by Congress. That is precisely what will happen in this case. The holding of another convention, and the framing of a constitution, are conditional, preliminary acts, inchoate acts, acts of no validity or force until sanctioned by Congress. Now, if the people have that right to assemble to frame a constitution, which the honorable Senator concedes that they have, how is the transaction affected by the fact that the officer in charge of the territory, under command of the President of the United States, sanctioned that proceeding? If good without his interference, it is none the worse for his assent and approbation. He had the sanction of the precedent which had gone before in the case of California, and I hold that he was justified by the precedent. With regard to the danger of such a transaction, it amounts simply to this: The military governor of a territory of the United States, instead of opposing the desire of the people to establish a constitution and procure admission into the Union, favors it; instead of insisting upon continuing the exercise of military power, he favors that constitutional, proper, and usual method by which the military is relieved from further power, and the people, in the customary form prescribed by the Constitution, assume it to themselves. I see in this no cause of censure. The analogy to the passing of the Rubicon will be applicable when the military governor of the territory, or the prefect, comes home to the Capitol, followed by his army, and proceeds to expel the Senate or the Congress, and to subvert the Constitution; but it strikes me as a strange misapplication of that transaction, so memorable in history, to apply it to a military governor who resigns his power altogether to the people, favors the establishment by them of a constitutional government, and thus reduces himself from the rank and power of a prefect, to the rank of private citizenship.

The leading points made by Mr. SEWARD, are

1st. The denial of jurisdiction by Congress over an offence punishable by the laws of war.

2d. The peculiar situation of Congress, with regard to the territories, through its failure, to make any provision for their Government.

3d. The inevitable consequence resulting from this neglect, that a military government should prevail there—and its continuance in consequence of the failure to provide a civil one.

4th. The attempt to claim the cover of the California precedent, and screen Col. Munroe's action in Santa Fe, and that of Col. Mason in California—and deprecating any censure upon the Governor of New Mexico therefor.

5th. The analogy attempted to be drawn between the application on the part of the population of New Mexico for a territorial, and their demand for a State organization; and the interference of the military command, is justified on the ground of his sanctioning the proceeding, not effecting the transaction.

These are Mr. SEWARD's main points. Let any one read the *Republic's* leader of yesterday, and decide whether it is not substantially a repetition of the same reasoning, vindicating the same irregularity, and attempting to fasten upon the country the same line of policy as that which Senator SEWARD and his staunch allies have ever advocated and pursued with a pertinacity that would have been honorable and praiseworthy if exhibited in a better cause.

We make no charges—nor intend any insinuations as to corrupt combinations between the two poles suddenly brought into contact from opposite points. Our business is to deal with things as we see them—and unless our vision and our perception both have suddenly become dim and deceptive, the speech and the editorial referred to are as like as two peas—and place the Administration and Senator SEWARD in a conjunction, as close as that of the old man of the sea, and Sinbad the sailor.

Oh for one hour of Pato Alto! that the old soldier might reject the counsels of cautious strategists, and march straight onward in the face of danger, now as then—true to his position, to his section, to his country, and to his own future fame.

We have good reasons for believing (on the best authority) that the Southern Whigs, as a body, will repudiate and disown this policy, as destructive of the dearest interests of their section, which they are patriotically determined to support under any exigency that may arise. They have counselled with each other on this topic, (we have reason to believe), and if the Administration will fling itself blindly into the arms of the North, it need hope hereafter for no aid and comfort from Southern men, who will not merge patriotism and principle in mere party. Should the Administration be found to have settled down on this line of policy, it must have prepared itself to meet the strenuous opposition of the undivided South.

It is stated that ladies in California wear pantaloons. It is generally understood that some of those, this side of the cold country do the same.

**Attitude of the Executive.**  
It is officially announced that as the Federal Government by a portion of its army, is in possession of the territory in dispute between the State of Texas, and some persons in a place called New Mexico, and that the President will maintain that possession by force, against the claim of Texas.

Now, in the first place, there is no such thing legally known as the people of New Mexico. The treaty of Gaudaloupe Hidalgo cedes to us a territory defined by certain limits, which includes all of what Mexico considered Texas, and a part of what she claimed to be Tamaulipas, Chihuahua, and Zacatecas, as well as part of California and New Mexico. So far as the treaty speaks of the people of the ceded territory, and stipulates concerning them, it speaks of them as one, and says nothing about New Mexico or California; and when we acquired this people and territory, the political distinctions between these provinces and parts of provinces, under the Mexican Government, ceased at once with the control of the Mexican governors.

But certain persons including Government agents and army officers, undertake to divide this territory according to their fancy between themselves, and assume to be the people of the territory they thus appropriate. Knowing, however, that all such proceedings are nullities, unless ratified by Congress, they apply to that body for sanction. But their claims are conflicting. Those who pretend to be the people of New Mexico appropriate a large population and territory, claimed by Texas, fourteen years before. And those who profess to be the people of California claim a large territory previously appropriated as part of Utah.

In this state of things, and before Congress acts, the President without a particle of authority from Congress, or the Constitution or laws, and knowing that Texas, a sovereign State, has in her constitution, included a great part of the territory of what is called New Mexico in her limits, sends orders to his military subordinate to co-operate with the pretended people of New Mexico in forming a State Constitution. And, in admitted obedience to these orders, that functionary, on the suggestion of sundry persons in that country, issues a proclamation to "the people of New Mexico," to meet in certain counties—counties totally unknown to us as political divisions, to form a State Constitution.

Now, if the claim of Texas to a great number of these very pretended counties is good, here is the co-operation of a military officer of the United States in command of her troops, with a portion of the population of a sovereign State of the Union in committing treason or rebellion against their sovereign!—and this by order of a President of the United States.

The reasons assigned for this unprecedented conduct are,

1. That the United States are, by their military force, in possession of the disputed territory, and are entitled to hold the possession until the question is settled.

Why the United States military force is, in that respect, or may be, in possession of all the States of the Union—for its forces are stationed in nearly all, and are marched into, and through all, by the mere order of the President.

But New Mexico is a Territory, and a Territory is not like a State, but is under the exclusive authority of the Federal Government. Well, a territory is under the control of Congress, not of the President for the power of Congress over territories is an implied power, resulting from the power to hold or to acquire them, and all implied powers are expressly conferred on Congress.

Now, Congress knew as much about the position of affairs in the new territory as the President—knew that Texas claimed a large part of it—that she was about to organize a government over it—and that the inhabitants of New Mexico wanted to be a separate people, and wanted a territorial government. And yet, whilst Congress was deliberating on this very state of things, and abstaining, in the interval, from all resistance to Texas, the President interposes, tells his officers to aid the inhabitants of New Mexico, aliens to us in every thing—in opposition to Texas kindred in all—and now he announces that he will resist the attempts of Texas to establish her jurisdiction.

2. Another ground on which the claim of Executive intervention is based, is, that by treaty, the people of these territories have a right to be admitted as citizens as soon as possible—and that he, as President, is bound by the Constitution, to see the laws faithfully executed—and a treaty is a law of the land. Well, if the execution of this treaty belongs to the President, it is for him, and not the Representatives of the State, and people, to prescribe the mode—to determine whether they shall have State or Territorial government—to decide whether they shall be divided into three or twenty States—to decide when they shall be admitted, and with how many Representatives in the House—to decide whether their Constitutions are Republican or not, and whether they shall be excluded from slavery or not.

3. But the third argument in support of the Executive, is still more monstrous. His conduct is defended or excused on account of the delay or neglect of Congress, to provide government, for the new territory. What! has it come to this, that powers conferred on Congress—if not exercised enure to the President—and he the judge of the degree of neglect or delay, that entitles him to assume them?

But how does the President provide a remedy for the neglect or delay of Congress? He has helped to make a State Constitution for these persons. We presume it will have to be submitted to Congress—and Congress may continue to neglect or delay—and may reject it. We suppose the President will hardly proceed in consequence of this neglect, to admit New Mexico himself.

But in the mean time he will assume that New Mexico—that part of it claimed by Texas—is in the possession of the United States. He will defend by force its inhabitants against any attempt at jurisdiction by Texas. A collision ensues. If the claim of Texas is good, the United States officers and troops will be liable, if captured, to the penalties prescribed by Texian law for resisting her officers. The order of the President to his subordinates cannot be plead because he had no right to give such an order.

We are told that some of General Taylor's friends are urging him to emulate the example of General Jackson. Well there was a disputed boundary question between the State of Ohio and the territory of Michigan, when Jackson was President. The dispute ran high. The Governors of both, marched out their troops. General Jackson instead of doing as the President is now doing—instead of holding the possession of the disputed country for the United States—ordered the United States officer, the Governor of the territory, Mr. Mason to retire, and requested the Governor of Ohio to desist until Congress could act—and it was done and the question settled amicably.

**Kentucky on the Compromise.**  
We have seen a letter from a well informed gentleman in Kentucky, denying most positively that the people of that State are in favor of the compromise plan before the Senate. He asserts that the late Kentucky Convention, instead of approving it, refused to pass the very resolution offered in its favor.

We have already given this statement before, in an extract from a letter of another gentleman of high authority.

We were amused at the terms in which Mr. Clay introduced those resolutions to the Senate—terms that would make the impression on any casual observer, that they were favorable to that measure. The editor of the *Union* went further. He said, referring to those same resolutions, that Kentucky spoke trumpet-tongued in favor of the compromise, when the only thing the resolutions themselves said, was to approve the motives of the Committee—a thing so unusual as to cause the inference, very naturally, that the measure itself was not approved, and if any thing were wanting to confirm that inference, the fact now stated, on good authority, that the Convention actually rejected the resolution in favor of this compromise is conclusive.

Mr. Clay stated in the Senate, on Thursday, that "during his life, which is not very short, he had never known the people of Kentucky so united, to a degree almost amounting to unanimity, as they are in favor of the compromise reported by the Senate Committee of Thirteen."—*Alexandria Gazette.*

Mr. Clay was correct. There is not, we believe, a newspaper in Kentucky that opposes the compromise, and, if there is an individual in the State who opposes it, we have not heard of him. We presume of course there are such individuals, but, if so, they are so few and so quiet that their very existence is a thing unknown.

The Southern organ at Washington city expresses the confident belief that full three-fourths of the citizens of the slaveholding States are opposed to the compromise. We have only to say that an editor who can believe this, must be possessed of the very convenient and comfortable faculty of believing whatever he pleases.—*Louisville Journal.*

We have seen but a few of the Kentucky newspapers on this plan of compromise. But we have seen as it happens better evidence of public opinion in Kentucky, than her newspapers, and that is, that the Constitutional Convention, of both parties, lately rejected a resolution in favor of this very compromise. Now, he who can say, as the *Journal* does, that he "has not heard" of an individual in Kentucky opposed to it, must have "a convenient and comfortable faculty" of hearing only what pleases him. We receive, probably, three times the number of Southern papers that the *Journal* does, and more than three-fourths of them are against the compromise.

**TEXAS BONDS AND BOND HOLDERS.**—We publish this morning a letter from Gen. HAMILTON, drawn out in part by allusions in the recent letter of Gen. Wallace to his constituents—allusions which, we presume, were meant for General Hamilton, but might be so construed. The question of Texas is in the very centre of the present controversy, and perhaps the most vital part of it, and that will add greatly to the interest which anything coming from Gen. Hamilton naturally excites. All our information assures us of the truth of his statements that Texas will not consent to the relinquishment of her territory South of 36 deg. 30 min., provided, always, there be no treachery practised, and that the Southern States shall show a determination to make common cause with her in the event of an attempt, by force, to invade her limits and rob her of her territory. For such an attempt the Executive seems quite ready, and the South ought not to be less ready to repel it.—*Charleston Mercury.*

**ARRIVAL OF THE STEAMER CITY OF GLASGOW.**  
The propeller steamer City of Glasgow, Capt. Mathews, arrived early this morning from Glasgow after a passage of 14 days and six hours, full of passengers and freight. We learn that her freight bill is over five thousand pounds sterling. We are indebted to Captain Mathews for Glasgow papers of the 14th of June, the day he left. Mr. George Catlin, formerly of this city, is delivering a series of lectures at Glasgow, on the North American Indians. Beyond the record of this fact, we find nothing in the papers of interest for this meridian.

**Congressional.**  
SENATE, Monday, July 24, 1850.  
A few petitions were presented.  
A resolution offered by Mr. HALE, directing the Committee on Naval Affairs to inquire if any additional regulations were necessary to prevent extra allowances being made to officers of the Navy, was debated by Mr. HALE, Mr. YULEE, and Mr. BURT, and finally laid on the table for the present.

**THE EXERCISE OF CIVIL JURISDICTION BY MILITARY OFFICERS.**  
The Senate then took up the resolution offered the other day by Mr. CLAY, directing the Committee on Military Affairs to inquire into the expediency of prohibiting by law any Military Officers of the Army of the United States, from exercising any civil jurisdiction within the territory of the United States.

Mr. HOUSTON stated that as but a short period of the morning hour remained, he would prefer to go on with his remarks to-morrow morning. He therefore moved to postpone the further consideration of the resolution until to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

**ADJOURNMENT.**  
On motion of Mr. YULEE, the Senate proceeded to consider the following resolution submitted by him:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, do adjourn their respective Houses on Thursday, the first day of August next, at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Senate then resumed the consideration of the

**ADJUSTMENT BILL.**  
Mr. UPHAM resumed the floor, and continued his speech of yesterday. He continued the catalogue of Southern aggressions on Northern rights. He showed the statistics of the Revolutionary war. He showed the number of troops furnished by each State of the Union. He thought this ought to be a warning to the South, if they preferred division and civil war to the Constitution.

He spoke on the subject of fugitive slaves, and contended that the North had done all that the Constitution required. He was in favor of a trial by jury for fugitive slaves, in the place where the fugitive is arrested.

He was opposed to the bill. He did not like the conglomeration of subjects contained in it. Each measure should stand on its own merits. California should be admitted *per se*, upon her own merits. This had been recommended by the President of the United States.

He was opposed to the bill, because it did not contain an inhibition of slavery. If the ordinance of '87 had been applied to this measure, it would not be so objectionable to him.

He did not attach any importance to the objection that there was not sufficient population in California to entitle her to two representatives.

He then proceeded to consider the question of the admission of new States out of Texas, as proposed in the resolutions of annexation. He took the same ground on this question as was taken by Mr. SEWARD, "Congress may admit new States."

It was not absolute on Congress to admit new States. The expediency or inexpediency of admitting new States depended on the discretion of Congress. He therefore was opposed to the formation of new slave States out of Texas.

He commented on the Texas boundary question. He did not think Texas had any just claim to New Mexico. He was opposed to the whole bill and should vote against it.

Mr. CLAY thought it would be better not to fix a day of adjournment until the important questions pending before the Senate be disposed of. He was as anxious as any one that Congress should adjourn early, but he was unwilling to fix a day at this time. He would, therefore, move to postpone the further consideration of the resolution for two weeks.

Mr. YULEE was in favor of an early adjournment of Congress. It would give time for the wishes of the people to be ascertained. He opposed the motion of Mr. CLAY, and was in favor of the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. WESTER thought it best not to fix a day of adjournment at this time, and until the great question of the day was settled.

Mr. BERRIEN was of the same opinion.

Mr. DOUGLAS was willing to sit until the 4th of March, in order to settle these questions. He was, therefore, opposed to the resolution.

Mr. HALE agreed with the Senator from Florida, (Mr. YULEE.) All this excitement had been created here. He thought an early adjournment of Congress would be the best thing which could be done for the country.

The motion of Mr. CLAY, to postpone the consideration of the resolution for two weeks, was agreed to. Ayes 32, noes not counted.

Mr. SEWARD then obtained the floor, and spoke at some length upon the different features of this bill. He first took up the part of it relating to the boundary of Texas. He denied that Texas had any claim to the territory of New Mexico. He was not willing to pay Texas \$8, or 10, or 15 millions for territory to which she had no title.

It was proposed to make the Southern boundary at 20 miles above El Paso. He contended that this surrendered to Texas 77,000 square miles of the territory of the United States, and that it was not for the United States, and not from Texas. He said that although Texas had many claims on our administration, it would seem by this that Texas knew how to *coin money* out of the administration of the United States.

Mr. HOUSTON rose and wished to make an explanation, but

Mr. SEWARD would not yield the floor.

Mr. RUSK then called the Senator to order for saying that Texas knew how to coin money out of the administration of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT decided that Mr. SEWARD was in order. What he had said was merely a matter of taste, and not out of order.

Mr. SEWARD proceeded with his remarks. He contended that Texas had no title to disputed boundary with New Mexico. He was in favor of the immediate unconditional admission of California into the Union.

Mr. SEWARD finally gave way, and the Senate adjourned.

**IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**  
Yesterday after Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, had unsuccessfully attempted to induce the House to take up (for reference) the Senate bills resting on the Speaker's table.

The House proceeded to the further consideration of the Galphin case, to which

Mr. BRECK continued his speech commenced the previous day, sustaining the argument and conclusions, presented in his minority report from the select committee.

Mr. SCHENCK, rising, made a few remarks, in which he held that all other matters connected with the case had been beyond the control of the House, except that of the Secretary of War, that is by the action of the Congress passing the act of 1848. That, however, was a minor subject for an expression of the opinion of members; more especially as the Secretary, of his own accord had forced the subject matter on their attention.

It to become a precedent, the danger was, that high public functionaries would get to speculating on the treasury. He did not intend to cast reflections on the Secretary of War; his belief being that that officer was merely indiscreet.

Mr. S. finished his remarks by offering as an amendment to the amendment of Mr. THOMAS to Mr. BRECK's majority resolutions, which was in the following words:

Resolved, That while the House, after "full investigation," does not find cause to impute to the Secretary of War any corrupt conduct or fraudulent practice, in procuring an allowance and payment of the claim of the representatives of George Galphin, yet it does not approve his "relation" to that claim in this, that he continued to be interested in the prosecution of it, while it was to be examined, adjusted and paid by one of the Departments of the Government, he himself at the same time holding office at the head of one of the Departments.

Mr. STEPHENS, of Georgia, delivering the next speech, arguing to prove that there could not be a just claim against the General Government than that of the representatives of George Galphin. He dissented from the point made in the report of Mr. BRECK—that Governments were not to be regarded as payees of interest. In furtherance of this view, he quoted various cases (precedents) wherein the United States had not allowed interest, and others in which she had not only demanded, but had received it for her citizens from foreign governments. England's practice was similar to ours in such cases. This fact was beyond question. The views of Mr. JEFFERSON upon the subject of paying interest by Governments had been misinterpreted by Mr. BRECK. On the contrary, Mr. Jefferson's doctrine was that interest should not be paid by Government during or for accounts arising in time of war.

Mr. BURT (interrupting Mr. S.) said, that his report had not maintained that governments did not, at times, pay interest. His doctrine was, that such was not their general rule. True, there were more or less of such cases, all of which were, however, exceptions.

Mr. STEPHENS, (resuming.) He was happy to have the gentleman from South Carolina standing in that position; as he was prepared to show the truth of his reverse. Now, he affirmed, defying contradiction, that in the case of a wrong done the private citizen by another Government to which the sufferer owed allegiance, always demanded interest as well as the principal; and to sustain this view, he quoted a case in point.

Mr. BURT believed that to be but another exception to the rule.

Mr. STEPHENS again taking the floor, read from the opinion of Sir John Scott, to show that the practice of governments in such cases was invariably, as he held it to be. The gentleman from South Carolina could not produce a contrary precedent. All sustained the doctrine he had here laid down.

Mr. S. next reviewed the argument of the report, (of Mr. BRECK,) based on its assumptions concerning the opinions held by Mr. Wirt. He frankly admitted that, on a single occasion, Mr. W. held to the view urged in the report; but, subsequently, realizing its error, (he Mr. Wirt) had taken due care to place on record a full recantation of that position.

The declaration of the report that interest was never paid by Indian tribes in transactions in which the Government acted, (in the payments), or their agents, was incorrect. This was proved by a clause in the treaty of New Echota, which Mr. S. quoted.

When, in 1780, Georgia had seized the Galphin lands for the common defense, she had pledged her faith to pay six per cent. interest on the claims which those lands were encumbered. The lands accruing to the benefit of the whole Union, Georgia was no longer morally bound to make good this promise, which became a responsibility of the General Government.

All committees of Congress adjudicating on the claim had admitted its justice, though some held that it was justly payable rather by the State of Georgia, than by Congress. Thus, while individual members of this House argued that it was chargeable on the State of Georgia, a committee of the Senate and the last House of Representatives, had solemnly decided that it was fairly payable out of the National Treasury.

Mr. S. next held that it was due that in questions in issue between public officers and the Government, justice should be as scrupulously meted out to the former, as though he were merely a private citizen. He believed it to be grossly wrong that justice should be denied to the Secretary of War because that gentleman was in the public service. It was the best attribute of justice that she should be blind. He was as anxious to build up the great Whig party as any man could be. Not, however, as a mere party banded for spoils; but to preserve in full force and effect in the Government. The eternal principles of justice on which it was founded.

Mr. FEATHERSTON then rising said, that having been one of the Select Committee reporting on the Galphin case, he felt it his duty to take part in this debate. There was really nothing in the point which each and all of the advocates of the Secretary's conduct had insisted on most strenuously. He here referred to the declaration that the claim was just. Even if true, the fact was without bearing on the question before the House. It would have been a very fair and appropriate argument before the House when considering the act of 1848 under which the Galphin payments are alleged to have been made. But the members of the last Congress who had merely voted for that act, were in no manner responsible for affording grounds for the payment. It was not their duty to investigate closely into the character of the claim. What was the duty of the Committee on Claims, or on the Judiciary Committee, who had reported the bill. Members generally, as every one in the hall knew, had no time to do so, nor were they ever expected to look into the particulars of each claim coming before Congress. To attempt such an examination of even a respectable portion of them, would require every moment of the member's time.

Mr. CROWELL said that having been a member of the Committee on Claims of the last Congress, he desired to remind the House that the report in this case came not from that Committee, but from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia, (Mr. FEATHERSTON again giving way,) remarked that there existed no necessity for a speech advocating the justice of the claim, at the time the bill passed (in 1848). Its justice was not then questioned, owing to the representations of its friends. A single objection would have brought out such a speech that had not been started.

Mr. FEATHERSTON again resuming the floor, argued that according to the evidence of the late Secretary of the Treasury before the Select Committee, it was clearly proved that Messrs. STEPHENS and THOMAS were well aware of the impropriety of the act of Mr. Crawford in entering the Cabinet with this demand in which he was so deeply interested, pending before the Treasury Department. Mr. Walker had testified that the gentlemen called on him to urge that the Galphin case should be finally settled before he (Mr. W.) resigned his portfolio; stating that there existed reasons making its settlement of the new administration came into office a matter of prime importance. From this interview Mr.

Walker came at once to the conclusion that Mr. Crawford was to go into the Cabinet, having known the gentleman as a prosecutor of, and party directly interested in the claim.

Mr. F. next taking up the question of the justice of the demand against the United States treasury, examined it at length, holding that if just against any parties, it certainly was not so against the General Government.

If the question of interest had been referred to Mr. MEREDITH for his adjudication, (which Mr. F. denied,) it surely had been committed to him to be decided under the regulations and custom of his Department in the adjudication of claims on the Treasury. Now, it was notorious that in the payment of this claim, neither the one nor the other had been adhered to. Mr. MEREDITH had set them at naught, as the gentleman from Mississippi argued to show at considerable length. To meet such cases, he, Mr. F., should insist on the enactment of a law prohibiting a member of the Cabinet, or any high officer of the government, from settling the demands of other such officers in the public service.

A glance at the testimony of Joseph Bryan, given before the Galphin case committee, would at once satisfy any gentleman of the necessity existing for placing such a statute among the laws of the country. Mr. B. (said Mr. F.) while prosecuting this claim for Mr. Crawford before the Treasury Department, was also an attorney for Capt. Shannburg, in the prosecution of a demand on the War Department. He testifies that when urged by S. to push his claim, he (B) had advised him to wait patiently until a claim against the Treasury Department, in which the Secretary of War was interested, was settled, which would be in a few days; when having his own pockets full, the Secretary would, ten to one, be far more likely to look favorably on Shannburg's demand.

Mr. DISNEY next addressed the House for an hour, urging arguments to maintain the views of his report from the minority of the Select Committee.

Mr. McKISOCK having then obtained the floor, gave way to Mr. SCHENCK, who notified the House that he should propose the amendment at first offered as an amendment to that of Mr. THOMAS, as a substitute for the resolutions reported from the majority of the select committee by Mr. BRECK.

Mr. S. then sent to the Clerk's desk another amendment he proposed to move to the amendment of Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Mississippi gave notice of his intention to offer the following as an amendment (to Mr. SCHENCK's substitute): Insert after the word "approved," "but decidedly disapproves and dissents from the opinion given by the Attorney General in favor of an allowance of interest on said claim, and from the action of the Secretary of the Treasury in paying the same. And it does not approve of the relation of the Secretary of War to that claim in this."

Mr. BURT gave notice, the House approving, that on to-morrow at two, P. M., he should move to take the vote on the various propositions before the House with reference to this case.

On motion, the House then adjourned.

**CORRESPONDENCE.**  
FROM OUR BALTIMORE CORRESPONDENT.  
BALTIMORE, July 23—5 p. m.

Important Cuban Affairs.—The *Turf* Reviewed.—General Lopez.—Price of the Arts.—Curious Label Case.—The Northern Markets, &c.

The sudden departure of the steamer Vixen from Washington, with Commodore Morris on board, together with the announcement previously made by the Washington correspondents of the Northern papers, known to be in the confidence of Mr. Clayton, that the President was preparing to send to Cuba a distinguished officer of the Navy to demand the immediate release of the Contoy prisoners, attracts much attention in this city and the North.

We have had a fine shower of rain, accompanied with thunder and lightning this afternoon, which has caused quite an improvement in the atmosphere.

There is a fine sport to be found daily at the Baltimore trotting course, some of the finest trotters in the country being on the ground. The great match yesterday, between Lady Suffolk and Lady Moscow attracting a large assemblage. The first heat was won by Suffolk in 5 min. 30s., the second by Moscow in 5 min. 11s., and the third by Suffolk in 5 min. 16s. It was evident to all present that Moscow was the swiftest of the two, but on both the first and last heat she lost the race by breaking and flying the track. It was contended by her backers that she was defeated by a trick of the driver of Suffolk, who, when he found it necessary, would make her break by a loud crack and flourish of his whip. They will run together again next week.

It has been announced in New York by telegraph, that General Lopez is expected to reach there in a few days, and the Cuban advocates are collecting funds to give him a grand reception, and encourage him in carrying out his declaration that he had not yet given up his determination to revolutionize the Queen of the Antilles.

Lester's ivory chess was sold in New York at auction, yesterday, to a Mr. Davis, for the small sum of \$405.

Paine, the gas discoverer, has brought suit against the Boston gas engineer, Mr. Darracott, for libel, in calling him a humbug and cheat.

In the Baltimore market this morning there were sales of 200 bbls. Howard street flour at \$5.12, and some enquiry. Sales of 300 bbls. City Mills at \$5.18, and of 1000 bbls. at \$5.25. The supply of corn is very light. Oats, 43 cents. Whiskey, 25 cents.

At New York this morning, there were sales of cotton at last quotations, no change being caused by the Europe's news. Sales of new loan at an advance of 1/4. Common State flour has declined, but Southern is selling at \$5.62 a \$5.69.

**ARRIVAL OF THE EUROPA.**  
THREE DAYS LATER FROM EUROPE.

HALIFAX TELEGRAPH OFFICE, Monday, July 1, 1850.

The Europa, Capt. Lott, was telegraphed at four o'clock, and arrived at Halifax at 6 P. M. She left Liverpool at 11 o'clock, on the 28th June. The Asia arrived at Liverpool at 5 o'clock, a Saturday morning.

Cotton—Sales on Friday, 5000 bales, prices firm, but unchanged; sales of the week \$500. Flour—The market rather inactive. Sales of good ordinary, fine middling Jamaica, have been made at Liverpool at 4s 4d. At London, on Thursday, good ordinary native Ceylon brought 41 s 4d.

Sugar—In good demand for foreign, at previous rates. At London, the public sales of Thursday went off heavily, at last week's prices. Rice—8000 cwt. sold at 19s 3d.

Naval Stores—Turpentine in moderate demand at 5s. 8d. a 7s. 9d.

Tar—Sales of common Rosin, in good demand, at 2s. 9d. a 3s. 10d. per cwt.

Tallow—Dull, and prices unchanged.

Tobacco—Sales of 1000 hides, prices unchanged, but firm.

Ashe's—Limited demand, at 2s. 6d. a 2s. 7d. for pearls, and 2s. a 2s. 6d. for Montreal pots.

Iron—Scotch Pig, at 10s. 6d. a 10s. 7d. for the evincing a disposition to return to their labors at the reduced wages.

Oils—Lined, 27s. 9d. a 30s.; American Lard, 34s.

The money market continues easy. Thursday, Consol market was firm throughout the day, at one-half advance, closing at 96 a 96 1/2. Friday, Consols opened flat, there being a general feeling expressed against the decision of the Greek question. Very little business was done, at 95 a 96 for account.

The quotations of American stocks are unvaried, except for United States sixes, of '82, 103 1/2; '84, New York Stock at 103 1/2; '85, 97; '86, sixes, of '56, 96 a 97. Freight market has been stationary, but with a downward tendency in particular for New York. Dead weight continues very scarce